

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. To force their local stations to cancel locally enjoyed programs and air politically one-sided material is not in the public interest. It is certainly like Nazi Germany before and during WWII. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. This may be legal, for the stations are owned by Sinclair; Yet it does not pass the smell test. Something is certainly rotten politically rotten here. Is the FCC involved? They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Why hasn't the FCC raised the issue of fairness, public interest, protecting the air waves for democracy and local autonomy? Thank you.